

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

By the foregoing amendments, the claims of the present application have been amended so as to conform to the claims in the corresponding Japanese patent application, which has now been allowed.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11-12 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-247012, hereinafter *Yuichi*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,498, hereinafter *Shima*. And, claims 3, 7, 10 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yuichi* and *Shima*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,963,414, hereinafter *Iguchi*.

In the Official Action dated September 28, 2007, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by *Yuichi*. In response to that rejection, the claims were amended and arguments were set forth explaining the differences between the pending claims and *Yuichi*. The Examiner has now modified the rejection by combining *Yuichi* with *Shima*. In doing so, the Examiner acknowledges that *Yuichi* does not teach or suggest a printing job that includes both test print image data and a command. The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify *Yuichi* with *Shima* because the system will then have a way to prove the functionalities of the printing system, thus preventing errors when using the printing device to print some jobs or documents. \

However, Applicant submits that merely presenting a benefit of a proposed modification does not in any way explain why the modification would have been obvious. Although Applicant submits that the proposed combination is not proper under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicant has further amended the claims so that the printing job includes a command for modifying multiple items of a default setup, as well as a print condition instruction used for executing the printing job and test print image data. Applicant submits that none of the applied prior art references teaches or suggests the claimed combinations, and in particular, the concept of including in a printing job a command for modifying multiple items of a default setup as well as a print instruction and test print image data.

The command allegedly set forth in *Shima* is not a command for modifying multiple items of a default setup. As set forth in the remarks filed on December 27, 2007, by including the default setup modifying command, together with the test print image data and a test printing job, the manufacturer may test the printer and set the default setup to the appropriate setup in one operation. By combining the processes of running a test print and setting the default image at the same time, greater efficiency and a reduction in human error is accomplished.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that each of the independent claims has been amended so as to conform with these remarks and arguments, and that each of the claims of the present application are therefore patentable over the applied prior art references.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney. Absent any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 15, 2008

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620